

4 September 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR: [REDACTED]  
Deputy Chief, FE Division

SUBJECT : Comments on "The Afternoon Scenario"

I think all the points or major areas are covered but do offer here for your consideration a few editorial items of detail it would be helpful to have clarified. My comments are keyed to your paragraph numbers:

1. We can also point out that the independent record from the depositions we have in hand of [REDACTED] interrogations in Saigon (the depositions being statements by his interrogators) that [REDACTED] other interview-type interrogations may have been held on the 11th. Thus, the implied future tense reference [REDACTED] that is found in all accounts we have of the [REDACTED] meeting, argues inferentially for a 10 June date rather than a 12 June date.

2. No comment.

3. The COS suite has three private offices coming off of the central room in which there were desks for three secretaries on my last visit. Two of these offices are small, one (Shackley's) is large. If the meeting was held in the COS suite it would be useful to clarify precisely which office it was held in, particularly if it was Shackley's office. If Ted happened to be downstairs with the Ambassador or across town somewhere when the meeting was held, it might very well have been convened in Shackley's office, since the other two private offices in the COS suite are small and would be cramped quarters for a four-person meeting. It is also possible that the meeting was held in the office of the Chief of the Combined Studies Division located in the MACV compound. Such a setting could also have provided a context germane to the point we are trying to unearth: Did [REDACTED] convey the impression that he was Chief of Station or leave such an impression in the minds of his military visitors? Many army elements think that Combined Studies is "the Station." It is conceivable that [REDACTED] was introduced as the head of Combined

SECRET/

25X1

25X1 Studies or that [ ] referred to him as "my boss" in a way that was  
misinterpreted by [ ] 25X1

4. To the extent that circumstances permit, try to clarify the  
discrepancies on who said what and who remained silent when, that now  
appear in [ ] memoranda on this meeting as compared with [ ] 25X1

5. In addition, it would be helpful to clarify [ ] stated  
reason for the meeting. The initial 5 July telepouch (paragraph one) mentions  
that [ ] came "to discuss coordination of an operation under DCID 5/1."  
No one has ever told us what this operation was or how the [ ]  
was raised in the context of a conversation about this other, unknown matter. 25X1

6. You have half the possible story. The other half is that during  
the course of this conversation on 10 or 12 June, it became clearly apparent  
that [ ] believed [ ] was Chief of Station and neither  
[ ] did anything specific to disabuse their two military  
visitors of this impression. If this latter hypothesis is close to what in  
fact actually happened, then [ ] could more or less truthfully answer  
negatively the questions put down in your memorandum. What we need to  
determine is whether anything stated or atmospherically surrounding that  
meeting could have given the impression to the two officers, or confirmed  
their misconception, that [ ] was COS. 25X1

7 & 8. This may be the opportunity to sort out just how many meetings  
there were between 10/12 and 16 June. Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the original  
5 July telepouch speak of one meeting with [ ] on 16 June but clearly  
imply either a second meeting or at least some form of follow-up visit or  
phone call at which [ ] name was given and revised views of [ ]  
assessment were also presented. 25X1

George A. Carver, Jr.  
Special Assistant for Vietnamese Affairs

SECRET/

25X1